



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,372	05/11/1999	KENNETH M. LASSESEN	3797.77742	7410
28319	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT 1001 G STREET, N.W. Suite 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/309,372	LASSESEN, KENNETH M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/07/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Appeal Brief filed 12/07/2005 to the original application filed 05/11/1999.
2. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 14 are independent claims.
3. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 12/07/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection s set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:
 - (a) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
 - (b) request reinstatement of the appeal.
4. If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Flanagan et al.** (US 6,993,471 – filed 11/1995).

As to claim 14

Flanagan teaches a method (*see fig. 8 and col.5, lines 1-17*) of displaying (*e.g., displays*) at least a portion of a document (*e.g., the translated document*) in a language (*e.g., his native language*) selected (*e.g., selects*) by a user (*e.g., the user 84*), comprising the steps of:

- (i) assigning to a plurality of words in the document a plurality of identifiers (*e.g., French if the user speaks French*), wherein each identifier corresponds to a respective one of a plurality translations for the plurality of words (*e.g., see the multilingual browser and machine translation system discussion beginning at col.5, line 1. See also fig.8*); and
- (ii) at a receiving computer (*e.g., user's PC 84*):
 - receiving the electronic file from a sending computer (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) [*see fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*];
 - allowing a user (*e.g., the user 84*) to select (*e.g., selects*) a language (*e.g., the desired target language*) in which the document

is to be displayed (*e.g., then displays*) [see *fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*];

- using an identifier (*e.g., French if the user speaks French*) from the plurality of identifiers to select a translation (*e.g., translated on-the-fly with a mouse click*) from the plurality of translations for the plurality of words, based upon the language selected by the user (*e.g., the user 84 of multilingual browser 82 selects the desired target language "e.g., French if the user speaks French"*) [see *fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*];
- replacing the plurality of words in the document by inserting into the document selected plurality of respective translation for the plurality of words (*e.g., HTML document (88) in language X is translated into HTML document (90) in language Y by machine translation system 80*) [see *fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*]; and
- displaying the document to the user (*e.g., then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90*) [see *fig.8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*].

As to claim 6

The rejection of claim 14 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Flanagan teaches an electronic file (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) [see *fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-16*].

As to claim 7

Flanagan teaches the electronic file is an HTML document (*e.g., HTML language X/HTML language Y; see fig. 8*).

As to claim 8

Flanagan teaches the translation for said at least one word is stored in a data structure on a server (*e.g., a Web Server; see fig. 8*).

As to claim 9

Flanagan teaches the data structure is an array (*e.g., see the HTML data structure discussion, beginning at col.4, line 40*).

As to claim 10

Flanagan teaches a Web browser displays the HTML document to the user (*e.g., The Web browser 82 then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90; col.5, lines 12-15*).

As to claim 11

Flanagan teaches the translated HTML document is provided to the user via the Internet (*e.g., the World Wide Web; see the Abstract and fig. 8*).

As to claim 12

Flanagan teaches a plurality of words in the HTML document are assigned a plurality of identifiers (*e.g., French if the user speaks French; col.5, lines 1-16*).

As to claim 13

Flanagan teaches a plurality of phrases in the HTML document are assigned a plurality of identifiers that correspond to said translation (*e.g., machine translation is integrated into a Web browser... allow the user 84 to rapidly and automatically translate online documents from the World Wide Web 86 into his native language... The user 84 of the*

multilingual browser 82 selects the desired target language, (e.g. French if the user speaks French), and the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click; col.5, lines 1-16).

As to claim 1

It is directed to a computer-readable medium for implementing the method of claim 14 above, and is similarly rejected in the same rationale. Additionally, Flanagan teaches:

- an electronic file (*e.g., online documents from the World Wide Web/ the Web document retrieved by the browser 88*) [see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-16];
- a first plurality of phrases, wherein each phrase of the first plurality of phrases is expressed in a plurality of languages (*e.g., The user 84 of the multilingual browser 82 selects the desired target language, (e.g. French if the user speaks French), and the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click*) [see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-16]; and
- a second plurality of phrases that are expressed in the language selected by the user (*e.g., The Web Browser 82 then displays for the user 84 the translated document 90*) [see fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 1-16].

As to claim 2

Flanagan teaches the electronic file is received at the use's computer via the Internet (*e.g., documents available on the WWW and displayed by browser; col.2, lines 18-61*).

As to claim 3

It includes the same limitations as in claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 4

It includes the same limitations as in claim 10, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 5

Flanagan teaches the Web browser translates at least a portion of the HTML document into the language selected by the user (*e.g., machine translation is integrated into a Web browser... allow the user 84 to rapidly and automatically translate online documents from the World Wide Web 86 into his native language... the Web document retrieved by the browser 88 may be rapidly translated on-the-fly with a mouse click; col.5, lines 1-16*).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments filed 12/07/2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-	Murat et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,987,402	issued: Nov. 16, 1999
-	Kurachi et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,092,035	issued: Jul. 18, 2000
-	Amro et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,324,500	issued: Nov. 27, 2001
-	Fields et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,412,008	issued: Jun. 25, 2002
-	De Hita et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,411,924	issued: Jun. 25, 2002

- Atkin et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,492,995 issued: Dec. 10, 2002
- Monahan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,523,037 issued: Feb. 18, 2003
- Leapaldt et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,757,688 issued: Jun. 29, 2004
- Maeda, Akira et al., "Viewing Multilingual Documents on Your Local Web Browsers", Communications of the ACM, Vo. 41, No. 4, April 1998, pp. 64-65.
- Kim, Hong et al., "A Presentation Agent for Multilingual Services", IEEE Network Operations and Management Symposium, Vol. 2, No. 9B, September 1993, pp. 634-644.
- O'Conner, "Java Internationalization: An Overview", Java Developer Connection-
java.sun.com, July 1998, pp. 1-9.
- Flanagan, "Java in a Nutshell", Second Edition, May 1997, pp. 201-223, 535-541.

Contact information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100